## Local Government Mandate Statement Kentucky Legislative Research Commission 2020 Regular Session

**Part I: Measure Information** 

Bill Request #: BR 1241
Bill #: SB 107
<b>Document ID #:</b>
<b>Bill Subject/Title:</b> AN ACT relating to medicinal marijuana and making an appropriation therefore
Sponsor: Senator Stephen West
Unit of Government: X City X County X Urban-County Unified Local
<u>X</u> Charter County <u>X</u> Consolidated Local <u>X</u> Government  Office(s) Impacted: county clerks and law enforcement, jails
Requirement: Mandatory _X_ Optional
Effect on Powers & Duties: X Modifies Existing Adds New Eliminates Existing

## Part II: Bill Provisions and the Estimated Fiscal Impact Relating to Local Government

SB 107 would establish a comprehensive system for state regulation of the cultivation, processing, sale, distribution, and use of marijuana and related activities for medicinal purposes. The bill would exclude medicinal marijuana from the definition of "marijuana" for purposes of Kentucky criminal law in KRS Chapter 218A. Marijuana activities in violation of the Act would remain a crime.

**Section 7** would establish a presumption of authorized use of cannabis if a qualified patient, visiting qualified patient, or designated caregiver has a registry identification card or the equivalent, and possesses no more than "an uninterrupted 30 day supply" [at their residence] or "an uninterrupted 10 day supply" (on their person) of medicinal cannabis. A law enforcement officer employed by an agency which receives state or local government funds would be prohibited from using state or local resources to investigate or arrest for activity believed to violate the federal Controlled Substances Act, if the activity complies with SB 107.

**Section 8** would prohibit consuming marijuana by smoking; would prohibit possessing, using, or being under the influence of medicinal marijuana while operating a motor vehicle, while on a school bus or school grounds, in a correctional facility, or on federal property.

Section 26 would authorize a local government by ordinance to prohibit, or to regulate the time, place, and manner of, cannabis businesses in its jurisdiction or to submit to voters the question whether cannabis businesses should be allowed. If a county prohibits all cannabis businesses, a city within the county may approve them within the city by ordinance or by vote of the citizens; a county prohibiting cannabis businesses may assess a fee to compensate for corrections impact caused by approval of cannabis businesses by a city within the county. Section 26 establishes the duties of the county clerk regarding submission of the question to voters.

**Section 27** would establish that information developed pursuant to the Act is confidential; disclosure would be a misdemeanor punishable by up to 180 days in jail and a \$1,000 fine.

**Section 32** would establish the *local* medicinal marijuana trust, funded by a portion of excise taxes imposed under Section 33 and distributed to local governments where at least one cannabis business is permitted; fund to be used for local enforcement of medicinal marijuana laws, local medicinal marijuana licensing, Drug Recognition Experts, local drug addiction rehabilitation projects, or educational activities within local jails.

Section 33 would impose an excise tax of 12% on the gross receipts of a marijuana cultivator or processor from the sale of medicinal marijuana to a medicinal marijuana dispensary located in Kentucky; 20% of the excise tax revenue would be deposited to the local medicinal marijuana trust fund established by Section 32.

## SB 107 would have an unquantifiable but likely minimal positive fiscal impact on local governments.

The local medicinal marijuana trust fund would be a new potential revenue source for local jails and law enforcement. The amount of revenue is unquantifiable since the number of businesses that would seek licensure and the number of jurisdictions that would allow such businesses is unknown.

In local governments that impose an occupational license fee the bill would increase revenue by increasing the number of taxable business units within the jurisdiction. As of August, 2019 139 cities, 68 counties, Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government and Lexington Fayette Urban-County Government impose such fees. A county may impose an occupational license fee of 1%-1.25% depending on the population. A first class city may impose a license fee of up to 1.25% on wages and net profits; home rule cities may levy franchise and license fees with no maximum rate specified. An occupational license fee paid by a medicinal marijuana business to a city would be credited against the fee levied by the county, so that the business would only pay to the county the difference between the two fees.

The bill should reduce the number of arrests and prosecutions by local law enforcement for marijuana offenses and so reduce those costs to local governments. It should result in fewer persons incarcerated in local jails and so reduce local jail costs, which are a significant expense to local governments. According to the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), in CY 2018 there were 12,599 convictions in Kentucky circuit and district courts for marijuana-related charges at the Class D felony, Class A misdemeanor or Class B misdemeanor levels. The great majority of those (9,507 cases) were for violation of KRS 218A.1422, possession of marijuana, classified as a Class B misdemeanor. Notwithstanding KRS 532.090 which fixes the maximum term of incarceration for a Class B misdemeanor at 90 days, the maximum term of incarceration for violation of KRS 218A.1422 is 45 days. While many first-time or low level marijuana offenders are fined or sentenced to a diversion program or other incarceration alternative rather than jailed, any reduction in misdemeanor convictions would represent a savings to local jails since they are responsible for costs of incarcerating misdemeanants who do serve time. It is not known how many of the persons arrested, convicted, and incarcerated for marijuana-related misdemeanors in 2018 would have been entitled to a medicinal marijuana defense under SB 107, but that number would represent savings to local jails of approximately \$31.34 per day/per inmate (using the amount the Kentucky Department of Corrections (DOC) pays a local jail for housing felony defendants as a cost estimate). The ultimate savings to local government resulting from a reduction in prosecutions cannot be quantified.

The availability of legal medicinal marijuana could result in a reduction in felony marijuana convictions and incarcerations as well. Conversely, a reduction in felony convictions could represent a loss in revenue to local jails, since the DOC pays local jails a per diem and medical expenses of \$31.34 per day for each felon housed in a local jail. Since the per diem pays for the estimated average cost of housing a Class D felon, the per diem may be less than, equal to, or greater than the actual housing cost.

The legislation could also result in savings to local governments from its prohibition on state and local law enforcement expending funds to enforce the Federal Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. Sec. 801, et seq.). There could be some costs and additional administrative burden to local law enforcement to verify registration validity of a person possessing a registration card; however, distributions from the local medicinal marijuana trust fund would address those costs.

A jurisdiction would incur costs associated with adding a medicinal cannabis question to the ballot in an election. According to Harp Enterprises, a vendor that provides electronic voting machines to 96 Kentucky counties, there would be some additional programming cost to add a local option question to a ballot. For example, the cost to add a new category to the ballot for Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government, with 291 precincts, has recently been estimated at between \$3,500 and \$4,500, and for Franklin County, with 44 precincts, the cost has been estimated at between \$1,700 and \$2,500.

Marijuana cultivation, sale, and possession are all illegal under the Federal Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. Sec. 801, et seq.), and the total fiscal impact on local government revenues, expenditures and costs is indeterminate due to significant

uncertainties related to federal enforcement of that Act related to marijuana. The most recent communication on the subject of federal enforcement of federal marijuana laws from the U.S. Attorneys' Office is the January 4, 2018 Memorandum of Attorney General Jeff Sessions rescinding the Obama Administration marijuana enforcement guidance. The January 2018 Memorandum commits to federal law enforcement in each state investigative and prosecutorial discretion in deciding enforcement priorities.

States that permit marijuana production, distribution, and possession should create effective regulatory and enforcement schemes to address public safety, public health, and other law enforcement interests. If a state's efforts are insufficiently robust, the federal government may challenge the regulatory and enforcement scheme itself in addition to increasing the number of federal criminal prosecutions.

## Part III: Differences to Local Government Mandate Statement from Prior Versions

Section II pertains to the bill as drafted.

**Data Source(s):** LRC staff, Department of Corrections, Administrative Office of the

Courts; Harp Enterprises, Inc.; LRC staff

**Preparer:** Mary Stephens **Reviewer:** KHC **Date:** 2/11/20